

## REMARKS

It is believed that the examiner has inadvertently considered the wrong set of claims in this application. The original claims 1-12, as well as the specification, were amended on 11 October 2004 concurrently with the filing of the Demand in the PCT phase of the application. A copy of the IPER with annexes is attached hereto. The pending claims are therefore claims 1-10 as amended.

The changes made were in response to the reference to Lundin cited by the examiner in the office action. It is believed that the amended claims are novel and non-obvious over Lundin, and that the multiple dependent claim objection is moot.

The amended claims did however contain typographical errors that are corrected in the attached amendment. It is believed that the amendment should be considered a preliminary amendment, as no action on the merits of the actual pending claims has issued.

Furthermore, the specification and claims are being amended to substitute the word "articulated" for "flexible" in the claims 1 and 8, and on page 1 line 31 of the amended specification submitted under the PCT examination. This is in response to an objection raised in the IPER concerning possible new matter. The applicant disagrees with this position, as it is believed that the original disclosure showed two articulated chains that are by their nature flexible. The language is being amended, however, to further prosecution of this application.